

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

## *Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program*

### *Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011*

---

<b>Applicant</b>	City of Fresno	<b>Amount Requested</b>	\$2,231,086
<b>Proposal Title</b>	Fancher Creek Flood Control Improvement Project	<b>Total Proposal Cost</b>	\$4,462,173

---

#### PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The Project will remove 682 acres along Fancher Creek from the 100-year flood plain, provide improvements to inadequate local storm drainage systems, remove direct discharges to Fancher Creek, provide stormwater and irrigation facilities for future development, and further comply with the goals and objectives of Fresno's NPDES Municipal Stormwater Quality Management Program.

#### PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	9/15	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	9/12
Budget	3/5	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	6/12
Schedule	3/5	Program Preferences	8/10
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	4/5		
Total Score (max. possible = 64)			42

#### EVALUATION SUMMARY

##### Work Plan

The criterion is less than fully addressed and rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The application states that the design has started; however, no plans and specifications are included. The tasks are not adequately detailed to ensure a clear implementation of the Project. For example, the construction task doesn't identify pipe sizes, lengths, etc., nor does it clearly show how the various contracts tie together, such as Y-62, BO-20, and the Fancher Basin Improvements. The Proposal does a good job presenting goals and objectives, but does not tie them back to an adopted IRWMP.

##### Budget

The criterion is less than fully addressed and supporting documentation is lacking. A majority of the Budget tasks are not detailed and estimates were not explained. No references or quotes are provided to substantiate the estimated costs listed in the Budget. The Budget contains excellent detailed cost for the

construction which would involve grant funding; however, there is no detailed cost information breaking down the lump sum items such as administration, reporting, and the other construction items, such as contracts Y-62, BO-20, and Fancher Basin Improvements. It's difficult to see if costs are reasonable when they are presented as lump sums.

### **Schedule**

The Schedule is not entirely consistent and reasonable. The construction/implementation task is scheduled to begin on 10/31/11, yet the bidding and award period is not happening until 2/24/12. The environmental compliance/mitigation/enhancement task shows that it is already completed, yet it is difficult to see how this could be true as this work should take place during construction. The application identifies work on the Project has already been completed, such as the Fancher Creek Detention Pond, yet the Schedule doesn't reflect when this work was completed. The Schedule should be showing all the tasks including the work that will be counted as cost share.

### **Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures**

The criterion is addressed, but not fully supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. It will be difficult to measure success when the targets are not quantified. Some examples of unquantifiable targets include: noticeable decrease in flood complaints, reduce pollutants discharged, calculation of groundwater supply increase, and irrigate with non-potable water. The project is consistent with the Region's Basin Plan.

### **Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits**

High levels of FDR and Water Supply benefits can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and/or supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. The data source and valuation approach used to generate the great majority of the FDR benefits is not well documented, and possibly not consistent with more standard estimation approaches. Inundation depths are asserted but not documented. The value of water supply benefits does not account for the without-project destination of the water or the cost of pumping the recharged water for later use.

### **Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits**

Average levels of Water Quality and Other benefits can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. Water quality benefits are described as avoided sediment load and surface pollutants, plus blending benefits to existing groundwater. The quantified avoided flood insurance benefits should be included in the Flood Damage Reduction benefits, i.e., not in this category.

### **Program Preferences**

The proposal demonstrates with a significant degree of certainty that a number of Program Preferences can be achieved by implementing the proposed project. Thorough documentation with breadth and magnitude is provided for the following Program Preferences: Regional Project, Practice Integrated Flood Management, Protect Surface and Groundwater Quality, and Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently.